

**REMARKS****Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1, 4-6, 9, 12, 15, 16 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eguchi (US, 5,514,426) in view of Hasegawa et al. (US, 6,614,4910) and Son et al. (US, 5,545,738).

Claims 7, 8, 13, 14 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Eguchi, Hasegawa et al. and Son et al., and further in view of Kanbe et al. (US, 4,709,994).

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Claims 1, 8, 9, 14, 15, and 16 are amended, and claims 7, 13, and 20 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, claims 1, 4-6, 8, 9, 12, 14-16, and 19 are currently pending for consideration.

**All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 1, 4-6, 9, 12, 15, 16 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eguchi in view of Hasegawa et al. and Son et al., and claims 7, 8, 13, 14 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Eguchi, Hasegawa et al. and Son et al., and further in view of Kanbe et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

With respect to independent claims 1, 9, 15, and 16, as amended, Applicants respectfully submit that Eguchi, Hasegawa et al., Son et al., and Kanbe et al., whether taken singly or combined, fails to teach or suggest at least the features of liquid crystal injected between upper and lower plates maintains a monostable state and the transmissive axis of at least one of the

polarizers is at an angle within a range of 1 to 10 degrees with respect to an alignment direction of the aligned one of the upper and lower alignment films. The Office admits on page 6 that Eguchi, Hasegawa et al., and Son et al., does not teach the features of “a transmissive axis of one of the polarizers is at an angle within 1 to 10 degree (preferably 3 to 7 degree) with respect to alignment direction of aligned one of the alignment films.” As a result, the Office relies on Kanbe et al. for the teaching of “forming angle between the rubbing direction (axis O, the alignment direction) and the transmission axis of a polarizer (axis P1) is 6 degree. Therefore, it would have been obvious to those skilled in the art. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Applicants assert that none of cited references teach or suggest the combination of features recited in the newly amended independent claims 1, 9, 15, and 16. Although, Kanbe et al. may teach that the transmitting axis of polarizer is at an angle within 1 to 10 degree with respect to alignment direction of the alignment film, Kanbe et al. explicitly teaches that the liquid crystal display device has a ferroelectric liquid crystal under **bistability condition** with two stable states (Abstract, Examples 1-3). On the other hand, in the presently claimed invention, the liquid crystal display device has a Half-V switching mode ferroelectric liquid crystal at **monostable state** between the two plates. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Kanbe et al. fails to teach or suggest every element of independent claims 1, 9, 15, and 16, as amended. Thus, Kanbe et al. fails to cure the deficiencies of Eguchi, Hasegawa et al., and Son et al.

Accordingly, in light of the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that none of the cited prior arts, whether taken singly or combined, teach or suggest at least the features of amended independent claims 1, 9, 15, and 16, and respectfully request the withdrawal of rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Moreover, Applicants assert that dependent claims 4-6, 8, 12, 14, and 19 are allowable at least because of their dependencies from the respective one of the allowable independent claims 1, 9, 15, and 16.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

By: 

Robert J. Goodell  
Reg. No. 41,040

Dated: April 10, 2006

Customer No.: 009629

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 2000

Telephone: 202-739-7000